UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

Vs.

JOSE GARCIA,

Defendant.

GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE

The United States of America, through Michael J. Sullivan, United States Attorney for the District of Massachusetts, and William M. Welch II, Assistant United States Attorney, hereby responds to defendant Garcia's Motion in Limine as follows:

Crawford v. Washington, 541 U.S. 36 (2004) does not apply to present case. The principle enunciated in Crawford applies only to criminal prosecutions. Revocation hearings are not criminal prosecutions, and the full protections of the Sixth Amendment do not extend to revocation hearings. Morrissey v. Brewer, 408 U.S. 471, 480 (1972); Gagnon v. Scarpelli, 411 U.S. 778, 782 (1973). Therefore, the Sixth Amendment right to confrontation discussed in Crawford does not apply to supervised release proceedings. United States v. Hall, 419 F.3d 980 (9th Cir. 2005). See also United States v. Aspinall, 389 F.3d 332, 342 (2d Cir. 2004) (holding that Crawford does not apply to probation revocation because Crawford

and the Sixth Amendment apply only to "criminal prosecutions", and probation revocations are not criminal prosecutions); <u>United</u>

<u>States v. Martin</u>, 382 F.3d 840, 844 n. 4 (8th Cir. 2004) (holding that the confrontation right in criminal prosecutions does not apply to supervised release revocations because they are not criminal prosecutions).

Filed this 15^{th} day of September, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL J. SULLIVAN United States Attorney

Ву:

WILLIAM M. WELCH I

Assistant United States Attorney

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Hampden, ss.

Springfield, Massachusetts September 15, 2005

I, William M. Welch, Assistant U.S. Attorney, do hereby certify that I have served a copy of the foregoing by faxing said motion to:

Joseph A. Frank, Esq. 51 Park Avenue Suite 7 West Springfield, MA 01089

WILLIAM M. WELCH II

Assistant United States Attorney